

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

x Chief, Central Planning Staff

x 10/5 Chief, Security Branch

References:

- a. Attached copy of
Ltr. from Ass't. Dir.,
Bureau of Budget,
29 April 1946.
- b. Memo for D.C.I.,
dated 30/4, subject
as below.

SUBJECT: Establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, Sub-Committee for Security Control (Security Advisory Board).

1. The Presidential directive establishing the N.I.A. and the C.I.G., which was dated 22 January 1946, was the enclosure to N.I.A. Directive No. 1, dated 8 February 1946. Hence, a statement contained in the SWNCC ad hoc committee report of 5 February 1946, that there was no existing departmental agency which could then assume the OWI Security Advisory Board functions, was correct. The ad hoc committee, therefore, recommended that SWNCC set up a security control committee with a State Department chairman in order to assume the OWI Board functions. It should be noted, furthermore, that, even during the period this matter was under study (January - April 1946), C.I.G. was just being organized, personnel procured and initial policy procedures established.

2. In view of the fact that it took over six months to set up the SWNCC Sub-committee for Security Control, the old OWI Security Advisory Board having been abolished on 31 August 1945, the undersigned did not feel it advisable to stifle committee activity at this late date by initiating an action designed to

(over)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2000/09/11 : CIA-RDP64-00658A000100150017-4
in lieu thereof, recommended that the C.I.G. liaison officers appointed to the SWNCC Security Advisory Board closely observe its functioning in order to gather experience upon which to base a sound recommendation to the Director of Central Intelligence as to the desirability of putting the Board under the N.I.A.

3. Mr. Appleby, in the referenced letter, believes that N.I.A. should undertake this security activity. Although I agree with him in principle, I feel that we should attend a few of the meetings to determine if there is a real necessity for such a Board. If there is, it will be very easy to put it under N.I.A. and directly influence its activities by announcing a member of the C.I.G. as coordinator, possibly even as chairman, depending on the degree of control desired.

4. It is quite evident that there are many other intelligence activities now under the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, Joint Intelligence Committee and other comparable bodies which eventually should be taken under the wing of C.I.G. A complete survey of these bodies might well be initiated to determine those activities which lend themselves to N.I.A. (C.I.G.) control. Up to this time some similar surveys have been initiated, but on rather a piece-meal basis. If an over-all survey is conducted, a high-level policy decision must be made as to how far N.I.A. (C.I.G.) should go in assuming direct staff supervision of common-interest intelligence activities.

5. It is believed that Mr. Appleby's letter to Mr. Anderson may result in N.I.A. being requested to assume staff supervision of the Security Advisory Board activity at a somewhat earlier date than was anticipated in our recent recommendation to Admiral Souers. It is, therefore, recommended that we await further action on the part of either Mr. Appleby or Mr. Anderson, Acting Chairman of the Board, and if this does not materialize, to continue under the current recommendations made by the Central Planning Staff to Admiral Souers on this matter.

T.J.S.

CONFIDENTIAL